Self- and Peer Ratings of Personality Traits: Evidence of Convergent and Discriminant Validity among Hong Kong University Students

Michelle Siu Mui Yik

Chinese University of Hong Kong

Running head: SELF-OTHER CONVERGENCE

A thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology of the Chinese University of Hong Kong in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Philosophy Degree in Psychology.

March, 1993.

Acknowledgements

I hereby would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Michael Harris Bond for his unfailing support in the preparation of the thesis. Thanks also go to Dr. Kwok Leung and Dr. B. L. Chua for their perceptive comments and generous encouragement.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Steven So, who has been giving me spiritual support and cheers throughout the whole research process.

Abstract

The present study reported the validity of a personality measure by relating the self-reports of personality to (a) the corresponding peer personality ratings and (b) the peer perception of the individual's group behavior in twenty-one groups of university students. All (but one) correlations between self-reported and peer-rated personality ratings were significant at the 0.01 level. The inter-rater agreement and self-other convergence varied as a function of trait observability. The study found no evidence for the moderator effect of self-rated Extraversion. The relationship between self-reports of personality and group behavior varied as a function of trait salience and manageability of the behavioral dimensions in a group context. Finally, it was found that neither self-enhancing nor self-effacing tendency contributed an increment of percentage variance over and above the self-ratings and peer ratings in explaining self-esteem. It was however evident that self-esteem was just a halo or glow involving a positive self-perception in the socially desirable qualities.

Self- and Peer Ratings of Personality Traits: Evidence of Convergent and Discriminant Validity among Hong Kong University Students

Validity is a fundamental issue in personality assessment. Psychologists are particularly concerned with whether the tests really measure what they have been designed to measure. In personality research, test validity has been defined as "the agreement between two attempts to measure the same trait through maximally different methods" (Campbell & Fiske, 1959, p.83). The primary methods for assessing personality characteristics are self-reports on questionnaires; observers' evaluations, such as peer ratings; observation data derived from laboratory settings; and "real life" criterion variables, such as grades, promotions, and so forth (Cattell, 1946).

In the present study, the validity of a personality measure is going to be assessed by relating self-reports of personality to (a) observers' evaluations of personality and (b) observers' perceptions of the individual's performance in a small group setting. Besides, the degree of self-other discrepancy in personality impressions will be examined with respect to normal psychological functioning by assessing how the elevation of self-ratings (relative to others' ratings) on different personality dimensions is related to self-esteem.

Consensual Validation

Traditional trait models of personality have assumed that the traits assessed in people reflect real consistencies in their behavior and experience. This position has been under increased scrutiny and challenge by some researchers (e.g., Mischel, 1968), however. They have argued that traits are merely cognitive constructs imposed on the perceptions of self or others, that is, schema for person perception. The low validity

coefficients (the 0.30 barrier) typical of research relating self-reported measures to external criteria indicate a tenuous link between personality and observable behavior (Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Mischel, 1968). Even worse, some critics contend that the personality impressions people have of themselves and others are actually myths. The apparent consistency of personality structure is an artifact of the semantic hypothesis which states that personality ratings are subject to distortions arising from the semantic or conceptual similarity of the words incorporated in the rating scales used in the research (e.g., D'Andrade, 1974; Shweder, 1975). In sum, as Rosenberg (1979) stated, "With reference to dispositions, however, people may not see themselves as they really are, nor do others necessarily see them as they see themselves; the certainty that comes from consensual validation is lacking" (p.6).

Measures that share the same method of observation (e.g., self-reports correlated with self-reports) are subject to the same kinds of biases and the validity coefficient thus reported may simply reflect shared error variance (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). When self-report measures are correlated, shared artifacts of defensiveness, extreme responding, or acquiescence effects may be responsible for the associations disclosed. On the other hand, when peer-rating measures are correlated, the inter-rater agreement might be spuriously inflated by stereotypic inferences (Weiss, 1979) that are shared among the raters. For example, judges will use extraversion cues and their common implicit personality theories to make their (similar) judgements about a target person. When their ratings are correlated, the validity coefficients resulted reflect their shared stereotypes rather than the real consistencies in behavior exhibited by the ratees.

Nevertheless, we could test the proposition that our impression of personality

really reflects veridical attributes of a person by a comparison of self-report personality measures with ratings by individuals who know the ratees well (e.g., group members in a working team). In this case, it is postulated that a human observer who can interpret specific behaviors as evidence of underlying traits, is free from the biases of self-reports, as mentioned above. None of the usual artifacts is shared between self-reports and peer ratings, and none of them can account for the agreement between these two methods of observation. As Wiggins (1973) commented, well-replicated agreement across self-reports and peer ratings would provide compelling evidence for the existence of "real" dispositions, and this can be regarded as the consensual validation of personality traits.

Peer Ratings

Despite the fact that peer raters can show acceptably high level of inter-rater agreement (Kane & Lawler, 1978; Norman & Goldberg, 1966), several reviewers have discounted all these studies by contending that trait ratings made by peer raters reflect their own implicit personality theories or the linguistic categories formulated out of the scales, rather than the typical behaviors observed in the ratees (e.g., Mischel, 1968; Willerman, 1979). The research findings have shown that strangers' ratings on personality dimensions and those on similarity of adjective scales themselves had the same factor structure as ratings made by the close acquaintances (e.g., D'Andrade, 1965; Fiske, 1949; Passini & Norman, 1966; Shweder, 1975).

Nevertheless, using five well-established self- and peer rating scales, Norman and Goldberg (1966) found that ratings made by acquaintances had much greater inter-rater reliability than those made by strangers (0.70 versus 0.45). They concluded that

there is evidence for some degree of convergent and discriminant validity between

> the peer ratings and self-ratings on all five factors for the Peace Corps (acquaintances) sample, whereas there was no convergence for two of the five factors in the Passini and Norman (strangers) study and only somewhat tenuous evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for the other three factors. (p.689)

In Shrauger and Schoeneman's (1979) review paper, it was concluded that agreement between self and others was weak. Out of 36 correlational studies reported in their paper, only 17 showed support for the agreement hypothesis, with the significant correlations ranging from 0.14 to 0.76. However, many of the cited studies used single items and / or single raters in their methodology, that is, they employed measurement procedures in which reliability was low.

Aggregation over raters and items has been adopted by recent studies to tackle the above methodological problem. Paunonen (1989) obtained the validity coefficients for his twenty personality factors which ranged from 0.08 to 0.42, with a mean value of 0.24. Chaplin (1991), while using his eight personality factors which are supposed to tap the five major domains of personality (Norman, 1963), discovered the mean coefficient of 0.35 (ranged from 0.26 to 0.46). More, Paulhus and Bruce (1992) found the range of 0.18 to 0.51 for the personality factors in their peer-rating study.

If peer ratings are to be used as criteria against which the self-ratings are being validated, it is important that the peer ratings themselves have adequate reliability and validity. Using multiple raters is one technique to obtain reliable ratings; aggregating several items that define particular personality dimensions will yield reliable scales (Cheek, 1982; McCrae, 1982). Thus, aggregation over raters and items reduces errors of

measurement and contributes to the generalizability of findings (Epstein, 1980).

Moderators of the Relationship between Self-Reports and Peer Ratings

As previous authors have noted (e.g., Funder & Colvin, 1988; Kenrick & Funder, 1988; McCrae, 1982), much of the variance in self-reports is still unaccountable by peer ratings. In line with Mischel's (1968) argument, correlations ranging from 0.20 to 0.50 are especially discouraging -- as they represent only 4% to 25% of shared variance between self- and observers' ratings.

On the other hand, psychologists have been trying to seek explanations accounting for the variation in convergence between self-reports and peer ratings. This searching focuses on the question whether there are systematic ways of obtaining validity coefficients exceeding the high end of the 0.30 to 0.60 range, which is typical of properly administered peer-rating research (Cheek, 1982).

Individual differences. Moderator research in regard to individual differences has led to the premise that an individual's attributes will make self-other judgments converge. The most widely cited research is that done by Bem and Allen (1974). In their peer-rating study, they demonstrated how the consistency with which an individual manifests a trait influences the others to predict his or her own behavior. For the dimension of friendliness, average correlations of 0.57 were found between self-reports and a set of peer ratings for the "low variability" subjects, compared to 0.27 for the "high variability" subjects. The same result was found for the dimension of conscientiousness ($\underline{r} = 0.36$ for the "low variability" group and $\underline{r} = 0.12$ for the "high variability" group).

Another similar study was conducted by Kenrick and Stringfield (1980) who discovered that average correlations of 0.61 were obtained between self-reports and parent

and peer ratings for traits self-chosen as most consistent traits, compared to 0.23 for the least consistent traits. More recently, Zuckerman, et al. (1988) have also found supports for self-reported consistency as a moderator variable for self-other convergence. Hence, the moderating effects of self-reported consistency appear to be firmly established.

Other widely studied moderator variables include "empathy" (e.g., Mills & Hogan, 1978), "self-monitoring" (e.g., Lippa & Mash, 1981; Snyder, 1974), "self-consciousness" (e.g., Cheek, 1982), and "social communication skill" (e.g., Cheek, 1982; Wymer & Penner, 1985). So, it is reasonable to conclude that an individual's attributes, such as personality characteristics will affect the degree of convergence of self- and observer ratings.

People high on extraversion are characterized by being warm, talkative, and sociable. It is reasonable to expect that these people will manifest their personality characteristics more openly and explicitly. In other words, they are "more observable" to others. Hence, the observers will have a better and clearer exposure to the behavioral manifestations of ratees' dispositions, and higher self-other convergence in personality impressions is expected in this group of people. Never was this effect tested before and it is worthwhile to study it in the present study.

Trait observability. There is consistent evidence for a trait observability effect (Albright, Kenny, & Malloy, 1988; Funder & Colvin, 1988; Funder & Dobroth, 1987; Kenrick & Stringfield, 1980; Watson, 1989). The effect suggests that traits with more frequent, external behavioral manifestations show better self-other agreement than those that are subjective and internal (Kenrick & Stringfield, 1980; Paunonen, 1989; Watson & Clark, 1991). This theoretical view is best summed up by Zuckerman and Lubin (1985),

who stated, "While traits like sociability are almost entirely judged by public behavior alone, it is assumed that there is a private dimension to feelings that is only accessible through self-report data" (p.12). Therefore, the self-other convergence correlations should vary across different personality dimensions that differ with respect to the observability level. The correlations will be higher in those dimensions which are rated as more observable, such as extraversion (McCrae, 1982; Paulhus & Bruce, 1992;).

Perceiving Group Members' Group Behavior

Bales and his colleagues (1970; Bales, Cohen, & Williamson, 1979) have developed such a set of dimensions in a scheme for the observation of social interaction (SYMLOG, an acronym for the Systematic Multiple Level Observation of Groups). At the heart of the SYMLOG system is the three-dimensional space of interpersonal behavior and perception. The three dimensions are dominant versus submissive (designated as Upward-Downward in the spatial system); friendly versus unfriendly (designated as Positive-Negative); and instrumentally controlled versus emotionally expressive (designated as Forward-Backward). These dimensions have been derived empirically from factor-analytic studies of behavior and performance perceptions of small interacting group members (see Bales, 1970).

SYMLOG provides several options: the scoring of interaction acts, nonverbal communication, and verbal content for making detailed observations and descriptions of actors one by one, in the course of the actual interaction, at the time each act occurs on the one hand, and the retrospective rating of individual group members on the other. Although the theoretical heart of SYMLOG is evident only in the scoring method, the rating method may best understood as a simplified global version of the operations

performed in the SYMLOG scoring on the behavioral level. The rating method provides a systematic way of recapturing from one's own memory a sufficiently clear picture of individuals and their relationship in the group.

Based on the trichotomization of each of the three dimensions into its two poles and a neutral middle, Bales, Cohen, and Williamson (1979) have constructed the SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form consisting of 26 vectors. Each vector is defined by an adjective cluster (e.g., "active, dominant, talks a lot") that is loaded on one or more of the three dimensions (the example cluster is loaded on the U-D dimension). Using the Adjective Rating Form, the rater retrospectively judges how frequently each ratee exhibited each of the 26 behavioral types.

In sum, the SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form provides a simple and economical channel for group members to observe the salient aspects of interpersonal behavior in small interaction groups (Isenberg & Ennis, 1981). As the personality scales and the SYMLOG system come from different origins and are designed for different purposes, external validity can be established for the self-reported personality by correlating the self-reported measures of personality impressions to the perception of individual performance in groups.

Discrepancy in Self-Other Personality Ratings

A traditional conception of mental health claims that establishment of contact with reality is a hallmark of mental health. Accurate perceptions of self, the world, and the future are essential elements for healthy psychological functioning. Yet considerable research evidence testifies to the prevalence of illusion in normal human cognition (see Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Greenwald, 1980). Normal subjects judge positive attributes as

being more characteristic of themselves than of average people (Alicke, 1985; Brown, 1986). Since it is illogically possible that most people are better off than the average, this phenomenon is regarded as illusory and unrealistic in nature.

The illusory nature of positive self-perceptions can be convincingly demonstrated when self-ratings are compared with observers' ratings, that is, social reality testing. Lewinsohn, Mischel, Chaplin, and Barton (1980) had observers rate college-student subjects who were completing a group-interaction task. Subjects rated themselves along some personality dimensions, such as friendly, warm, and so forth. Observers rated each subject on the same dimensions. It was found that all self-reports were significantly more positive than the observer ratings; subjects saw themselves in more flattering terms. In sum, far from being balanced between the positive and the negative aspects, the self-perception of most individuals is skewed towards the positive pole of the scale. However, this lack of realism, though maladaptive, may be useful when an individual receives negative feedback or self-esteem is otherwise threatened.

Surprisingly, evidence suggests that individuals low in self-esteem, moderately depressed, or both have more accurate self-perception (e.g., Lewinsohn, Mischel, Chaplin, & Barton, 1980; Ruehlman, West, & Pasahow, 1985). These individuals tend to display smaller discrepancy between self-evaluations and evaluations of others (e.g., Brown, 1986) and offer self-appraisals that are more consistent with those made by objective observers (e.g., Lewinsohn, Mischel, Chaplin, & Barton, 1980). In short, individuals who experience psychological distress are more likely to process self-relevant information in a relatively unbiased way.

The previous findings introduce a dilemma here: On the one hand, the mental

health paradigm stresses the importance of accurate perception of self and others; on the other hand, normal individuals are engaged in substantial biases in their perceptions. Further, these biases fall in the positive direction, that is, we consistently rate ourselves higher than the others do. Together, these findings appear inconsistent with the notion that accurate perception is a hallmark of mental health. Taylor and Brown (1988) suggest that these positive illusions may have a functional purpose. They may be adaptive for mental health and psychological well-being, as normal people are more likely to have the positive conceptions of themselves and typically have higher self-esteem. Research evidence indicates that self-enhancement and other positive beliefs will be associated with higher motivation, greater persistence, and ultimately greater success. It is tempting to conjecture that a key to maintain certain level of self-esteem is that people have to judge their own qualities more benignly than others do. In Lewinsohn, Mischel, Chaplin, and Barton's (1980) words, "To feel good about ourselves we may have to judge ourselves more kindly than we are judged."

Self-Effacement in Chinese Culture

The aforementioned research findings are about how the discrepancy between self- and others' ratings are related to psychological functioning in the American culture. None of the previous studies has been conducted with a Chinese population to address the relationship between self-other discrepancy in personality impressions and psychological functioning.

Self-esteem, as the evaluative component of the self-concept, has been shown to be related to psychological well-being (Wessman & Ricks, 1966; Lau, 1989), life satisfaction (Leung & Leung, in press), and (negatively to) depression (Tennen & Herberger, 1987).

In Chinese societies where harmony is a core component in thought (Zuckerman, 1979), people are especially concerned with maintaining harmony in their social relationships. Group harmony is partly maintained by humility of group individuals. It is therefore not surprising that humility is a highly valued and model characteristic in Chinese interpersonal relations (Tseng, 1972). Reasoning that humility is such a pervasive demand in Chinese societies, people are led to "seeing themselves less positively" in order to maintain a positive sense of self-concept, that is, self-esteem. Contrary to the findings in the West, it is postulated that Chinese people tend to make self-deprecating attribution in order to maintain the level of self-esteem.

The Present Study

This study adds to the previous literature by tracking the relationship between self-reports and peer ratings on eight, factor analytically derived personality dimensions measured by the Sino-American Person Perception Scale (SAPPS) (Yik & Bond, 1993). The SAPPS consists of eight socially desirable dimensions, namely, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect, which tap the full range of individual differences in Chinese person-perception. It is hypothesized that the validity coefficients (self-other convergence) will exceed the 0.30 barrier as careful attention is paid to which subjects (group members in working teams in the present study) and which traits (eight orthogonal personality dimensions of which four items are used to define each dimension in the present study) are being evaluated (Hypothesis 1).

Moderators

To the best of my knowledge, no studies have been conducted to investigate the

moderating effect of self-rated extraversion on self-other convergence for other personality dimensions. Given the "observability" of the extroverted people, it is hypothesized that subjects high on Extraversion will evidence higher self-other convergence on various personality dimensions than those who score low on this dimension (Hypothesis 2).

Observability measures will be collected from a small group of subjects for the thirty-two items defining the eight SAPPS dimensions. Judges, while perceiving others, seek out extraversion information first, as it is very useful in guiding later interactions. Besides, the behavioral cues for this dimension appear directly observable and need not to be inferred. Hence the observability ratings will be highest for Extraversion (Hypothesis 3). If this is the case, peers' exposure to the Extraversion cues will lead to increased consensus (Paulhus & Bruce, 1992), thus Extraversion will evidence highest self-other convergence and inter-rater agreement as well (Hypothesis 4).

A strong link between inter-rater agreement and self-other convergence has been discovered by Funder and his associates (Funder & Colvin, 1988; Funder & Dobroth, 1987). This link probably indicates that some traits are generally easier to observe or judge than others. It seems logical to postulate that a similar effect might exist in the present study. By correlating the observability ratings with inter-rater agreement and self-other convergence in the SAPPS dimensions, it is predicted that observability ratings will be positively correlated with the latter two measures respectively (Hypothesis 5), as the more observable the dimension is to the public, the easier it is for the judges to gain consensus among themselves, and the more probable it is to obtain a higher self-other convergence.

SYMLOG

The validation of the self-reports on the SAPPS personality dimensions can be established by relating them to the averaged peer ratings of the SYMLOG dimensions. Since these ratings originate from different sources, one using self-reports of personality trait scales and the other using peer ratings of the salient aspects of the small group interaction, the methods of observation are different. Any shared variance disclosed thus reflects the validity of the SAPPS (i.e., how self-perception of personality predicts others' perception of one's individual group performance). Since this investigation is exploratory in nature, therefore, no specific hypotheses are made.

Self-Effacement

Finally, in a collectivistic culture like in Hong Kong, modesty is highly valued. It is postulated that the self-ratings will always be lower than the peer ratings on the socially desirable factors, that is, the SAPPS dimensions (Hypothesis 6).

With regard to self- and peer ratings, there are two types of discrepancy. First, it is the absolute discrepancy and the concern is about the absolute deviations of averaged peer ratings from self-ratings. In accordance with the mental health paradigm, accuracy in perception can be defined in terms of the absolute difference between self- and others' ratings, with the latter being defined as social reality. It is postulated that self-esteem will be negatively correlated with the absolute difference across all personality dimensions (Hypothesis 7), the higher the self-esteem, the smaller the gap between self-perception and the peer ratings.

The second type of discrepancy is concerned with the direction of the difference. For example, when peer ratings are subtracted from self-ratings, the resulting difference

will be positive or negative. In a Chinese society like Hong Kong, self-esteem indicates how well one fits in and preserves relationships and interpersonal harmony (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), whereas the group harmony is partially maintained by the modesty of group members. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the self-enhancement tendency (i.e., discrepancy score when peer ratings are subtracted from the self-ratings) will be negatively correlated with self-esteem, as the former will hinder people's interpersonal relationship and group harmony, thus lower the self-esteem (Hypothesis 8).

Method

Subjects

One hundred and thirty university students (47 males and 83 females), working in 21 groups (for three assignment projects) consecutively for three months in an introductory course on social psychology at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, participated in this study as partial fulfilment of their course requirement. Of the 21 groups, there are five, 5-member groups, seven, 6-member, and nine, 7-member. These students, coming from the arts, business administration, science, and social science faculties of the University, were either in their third or final years of undergraduate studies.

Measures

Among the questionnaires completed by the subjects were the SAPPS, the SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form, and Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale. In addition to the above measures, personal information was also obtained from the subjects, such as gender, individual group grade (which is determined by each group independently with regard to the individual contribution to finish group assignments), and their examination

grade in the course.

SAPPS. The Sino-American Person Perception Scale (SAPPS) is a comprehensive and reliable measure of Chinese person-perception (Luk & Bond, 1992; Yik & Bond, 1993) , and the Chinese version was used in the present study. It provides Chinese subjects with a measure of personality characteristics on eight dimensions, namely Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Helpfulness, Restraint, and Intellect. The original SAPPS - short form consists of thirty-two bipolar items, with each of the eight independent dimensions measured by four items. The items of the eight dimensions were mixed randomly with half of the positive poles on the right and the other half on the left. Subjects in the present study were asked to respond on a 9-point rating scale to indicate how suitable each pair of opposing adjectives was in describing themselves and each of their group members respectively.

SYMLOG. The System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups (SYMLOG) Adjective-Rating Form was included to measure subjects' performance in groups. It is intended to tap the three dimensions of interpersonal behavior, namely Upward-Downward, Positive-Negative, and Forward-Backward. The Form consists of 26 items and subjects responded on 3-point rating scales, with the anchoring points of rarely, sometimes, and often. The order of the items followed the original Rating Form devised and improved by Bales, Cohen, and Williamson (1979). Again, subjects were asked to indicate the frequency of each adjective cluster in describing themselves and each of their group members respectively. The present study used the English version of the form.

Self-esteem. The instrument used to measure self-esteem was Rosenberg's (1965) global self-esteem scale. It consists of ten statements and subjects were to indicate their

degree of agreement or disagreement to the statements on 4-point rating scales. Half of the items were worded negatively and half positively to control for the acquiescence response set. The present study used the Chinese translation made by Lau (1989) which he has shown to have high internal consistency and validity.

Procedure

The three sets of questionnaires were stapled together and put in an envelope. They were distributed to the students in the second last week of the semester. The students were required to finish the ratings individually and privately and hand them in with their final assignment of the course. Subjects were asked to make their ratings on the basis of their group interaction context. To counter-balance for possible order effects, half of the subjects responded to the SAPPS first and the other half to the SYMLOG first in rating themselves and their other group members (in accordance to the name put on the top right hand side on each rating sheet). Rosenberg's self-esteem scale was always put in the last page.

Results

Before investigating the correlations between self- and peer ratings, it is instructive to look at the associations among the eight SAPPS dimensions within each of the rating methods separately. These data are presented in Table 1, as follows: Scale intercorrelations for self-ratings are shown below the diagonal, whereas those for peer ratings are displayed above the diagonal.

Insert Table 1 about here

The most important finding is that these personality dimensions were significantly (and in some cases, substantially) correlated in both sets of ratings. The implication, for the present study, is to examine the discriminant validity in their construct validation.

Self-Other Convergence

The convergent and discriminant validity of the personality dimensions will be considered in this section. Table 2 presents the heteromethod correlations between the self-ratings and the averaged peer ratings.

Insert Table 2 about here

As noted, the results indicated a clear convergent and discriminant pattern. For the convergent validity, all dimensions showed a significant level of self-other convergence. The convergence correlations ranged from 0.17 (for Application) to 0.63 (for Extraversion), with a mean value of 0.38. Thus Hypothesis 1 was partially supported, five of eight dimensions showing the validity coefficients above the 0.30 barrier.

On the contrary, the off-diagonal values are generally lower, and most of them are not significant. Using Campbell and Fiske's (1959) criterion that the convergent correlation should be higher than any of other values in its row or column of the heteromethod block, five of the eight dimensions have acceptably high level of discriminant validity. Altogether, these results give support to the construct validity of the SAPPS dimensions. Self- and peer raters show a significant level of agreement in all dimensions, and further, are able to differentiate most of the dimensions from one

another.

Psychometric Properties

Table 3 presents the psychometric properties of the self-ratings and the peer ratings.

Insert Table 3 about here

The reliabilities of the self-reported personality dimensions were quite high, ranging from 0.67 (Application and Helpfulness) to 0.86 (Openness to Experience). The extent to which different peers agreed on the judgment of trait ratings to the same individual was calculated by examining intraclass correlations between factor scores assigned by different raters. Intraclass correlations are equivalent to the Pearson correlation between all possible pairs of raters (Haggard, 1958). The coefficients for the eight dimensions ranged from 0.31 (for Emotional Stability and Helpfulness) to 0.56 (for Extraversion), with a mean value of 0.43. Also the internal consistency of the averaged peer ratings for the dimensions was very high (with a mean of 0.89).

Moderators of Self-Other Convergence

Self-rated personality dimensions as moderators. Self-other agreement was studied as a function of self-ratings of Extraversion. All self-ratings of a dimension were first regressed on the respective peer ratings. Then the self-ratings of Extraversion (moderator variable) was entered into the equation. This was followed by the Peer ratings x Self-ratings of Extraversion. It is this product that carries the moderator effect, which will be revealed if the interaction term adds a significant increment to those predictor variables

already in the equation. This is so-called moderated multiple regression (Paunonen & Jackson, 1988). A significant moderator effect refers to stronger or weaker criterion-predictor correlation as a result of the magnitude of the moderator variable. Among the 7 regression equations calculated, none revealed a significant moderator effect of Extraversion at 0.01 significance level. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

In addition, the self-ratings of other seven personality dimensions were also used as moderator variables in the moderated multiple regression. The results indicated that none performed a significant moderator in the self-other correlations.

Observability ratings. An independent group of 16 undergraduates taking an advanced course on social psychology was asked to estimate the public observability of the 32 bipolar trait scales defining the SAPPS dimensions. However, because the poles representing a trait may be different in the degree of observability, both ends were rated. In total, the 16 judges rated 64 trait adjectives on 5-point rating scales, with 1 representing "very difficult" and 5 "very easy", on "how easy are the behaviors (related to the traits) observable to others in the group-work setting?"

Insert Table 4 about here

The reliability coefficients of observability ratings for the eight SAPPS dimensions were quite high, ranging from 0.47 (for Restraint) to 0.77 (for Emotional Stability), with a mean value of 0.63, indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency of the ratings. The mean correlation of mean ratings of one pole with those of the other for the eight dimensions was 0.64. Given the less than perfect correspondence between the

observability levels of both ends, therefore, the two observability ratings for each trait continuum were averaged and were used in the subsequent analyses.

As noted in Table 4, Extraversion had the highest mean observability rating (Hypothesis 3 was supported). Also, Extraversion evidenced highest self-other convergence and inter-rater agreement (Hypothesis 4 was supported).

The mean observability scores for the SAPPS dimensions were correlated with their respective inter-rater agreement estimates and self-other convergence correlations as well. It was found that the rated observability was positively correlated with the inter-rater agreement (0.52); it was also positively correlated with self-other convergence (0.76). Hence, Hypothesis 5 was supported, observability ratings were positively correlated with inter-rater agreement and self-other convergence in the eight dimensions. Also it is noteworthy that the inter-rater agreement was positively correlated with self-other convergence (0.63).

Factor structure of SYMLOG

Owing to a typing error, item 6 was deleted prior to further analyses. The averaged peer ratings on the remaining 25 items were intercorrelated and a principal-components analysis was performed, followed by a varimax rotation. A scree plot indicated four large factors with a clear "elbow" at the fifth eigenvalue. Thus, a four-factor solution which accounted for 67.0% of the matrix variance was examined. Further, items with loadings greater than or equal to 0.50 on more than one factor in the four-factor solution were deleted and the remaining items refactored. Finally, the refined factor matrix accounting for 65.4% of the total variance was adopted.

Insert Table 5 about here

The semantic meanings of the salient descriptions of the factors suggested the use of the following factor labels: "Dominant Behavior" (which resembles to Bales' dominance, consisting of the components of assertiveness and activeness, "Emotional Expressiveness" (Bales' task-orientedness, consisting of the components of watchfulness and neutral emotions), "Friendliness" (Bales' friendliness, consisting of agreeableness and interest in others, and "Distracting Sociability". The reliability coefficients for the factors were quite high, ranging from 0.75 to 0.87, indicating the factors were internally consistent.

Insert Table 6 about here

As noted in Table 6, self-ratings were significantly higher than the peer ratings in two of the four SYMLOG dimensions, Emotional Expressiveness and Distracting Sociability. These two dimensions were less socially desirable, and hence subjects displayed self-effacing bias in the self-ratings.

The overlap of personality and group behavior measures

Simultaneous multiple regression equations were calculated, using the four SYMLOG factors separately as dependent variables, the eight SAPPS factor as predictor variables. The results are given in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

The percentage of variance accounted for by the self-rated SAPPS factors ranged from 3% to 33%. The SYMLOG factor of Dominant Behavior was jointly predicted by Extraversion, Assertiveness, Helpfulness, and Intellect of the SAPPS; whereas there was one-to-one correspondence between the SYMLOG and the SAPPS dimensions: Emotional Expressiveness was predicted by the SAPPS Emotional Stability; Friendliness was predicted by the SAPPS Emotional Stability. As for Distracting Sociability, it was significantly predicted by SAPPS Extraversion.

Self-Other Discrepancy in Personality Ratings and Self-Esteem

Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics for the eight dimensions.

Insert Table 8 about here

It was evident that the averaged peer ratings were significantly higher than self-ratings in four (Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, and Restraint) of the eight dimensions (Hypothesis 6 was partially supported); and it was only Openness to Experience in which self-ratings were significantly higher than the averaged peer ratings.

When observability ratings were correlated with the respective self-ratings and peer ratings across the eight dimensions, it was found that there was a high and negative correlation between self-ratings and observability (-0.70); a negative correlation between peer rating and observability (-0.24). When hierarchical multiple regression was used to

investigate the percentage variance added by the modesty tendency (self-ratings subtracted from peer ratings) over and above the self-ratings and peer ratings, this tendency score added nothing in predicting observability.

On the other hand, when self-esteem was correlated with self-ratings of each dimension, seven of the eight correlation coefficients were significant at 0.001 level. The higher the self-ratings, the higher the self-esteem. Using multiple regression, self-esteem was significantly predicted by Intellect, Assertiveness, and Application (48%) out of the eight SAPPS dimensions. When self-esteem was correlated with the self-enhancement tendency of the eight dimensions, the resulting correlations ranged from 0.61 to 0.81

In order to examine the independent contribution of absolute discrepancy and self-enhancement over and above high self-ratings and other ratings to self-esteem, hierarchical regression equations were calculated for the eight dimensions.

Hierarchical regression. Self-esteem was first regressed on the self-ratings of each dimension. This was followed by the peer ratings of the same dimension. Finally, the absolute discrepancy was entered into the equation. It was the percentage variance increased by the final entry which carried the point of interest. If the increment was positive and significant, it meant the elevation of self-esteem was accompanied by the increasing amount of absolute discrepancy. For all eight equations, none of the discrepancy scores contributed to a significant increment in percentage variance.

When the same hierarchical regression procedure was applied to the examination of the relationship between self-esteem and self-enhancement tendency, again none of the enhancement scores added a significant portion of variance over and above the high self-ratings to the equation (predicting self-esteem) in both the eight dimensions. Neither

Hypotheses 7 nor 8 was supported.

Discussion

The External Validity of Self-Reported Personality

The present study provides clear-cut evidence for the consensual validity of self-rated personality perception. Self-other convergence correlations well above 0.30 and significant at 0.001 level were evidenced for five out of eight dimensions, namely, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, and Restraint.

Those correlations cannot be due to the artifacts of ego-defensiveness and acquiescence, because these sources of variance are never shared between the two methods of observation, namely self-ratings and peer ratings. These cannot be due to the semantic or conceptual similarity of the words incorporated in the personality rating scales. The similarity hypothesis cannot explain how the self-other convergence varied as a function of rater-ratee acquaintance (e.g., Paulhus & Bruce, 1992; Paunonen, 1989), nor the reason for variation in convergence across different personality dimensions in the present study.

All in all, the results obtained in the present study strongly attest to the validity of self-reports of personality. As McCrae (1982) said, "Personality is not a fiction, it is a set of regularities in human behavior and experience. Our challenge is not to prove its existence but to measure it adequately" (p.302).

However, it is interesting to note that the convergence correlations vary across the personality dimensions. Efforts were made in the present study to provide explanations for variation in self-other convergence.

Personality moderators. This study found no evidence for the hypothesis that

Extraversion by itself moderates self-other correlations. Neither do the other seven variables, contrary to data reported elsewhere about the possible moderator effects of personality variables (e.g., Self-monitoring by Snyder, 1974; Social communication skill by Wymer & Penner, 1985).

In commenting on this discrepancy issue, one should go back to the statistical evaluation of past research. The traditional technique of moderator research is to divide a group of subjects into subgroups on the basis of their scores on a suggested moderator variable. The self-other convergence correlation is computed within each subgroup and the correlations difference between the two subgroups is the moderator effect. However, when the moderator variable is quantitative, the use of the subgroup technique requires that the moderator variable be arbitrarily manipulated into qualitative subgroups. It is difficult to justify this subgroup conceptually (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

An alternative to the moderated subgroup method is moderated multiple regression, which was adopted in the present study. The interest is in the cross-product term that is entered last into the equation. This is a partialled product which is independent of other independent variables already in the regression equation. To conclude, moderated regression analysis is a more precise test of moderator effects than is subgroups analysis because it provides an independent estimate of the moderator effect of the proposed variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Despite of the careful attention to the moderator variables analyses in the present study, among the eight comprehensive and reliable personality variables, none of them performs the job of moderating self-other convergence. Perhaps, it is reasonable to conclude that personality variables may not be good moderators at all. As suggested by

Zuckerman (1988), moderators may operate jointly rather than singly to produce their effects in self-other convergence. It is advisable to explore this line of research in future (e.g., Chaplin, 1991; Paunonen, 1989).

Trait specificity. There is consistent evidence for a trait observability effect (Funder & Colvin, 1988; Watson, 1989). Traits with more frequent, external behavioral manifestations show better self-other convergence. These traits also show better agreement among raters. Funder and Colvin (1988) have reported the strongest evidence of this observability effect. They found that all five of their agreement indexes (i.e., self-friend, self-stranger, inter-friend, inter-stranger, and friend-stranger) were significantly correlated with the rated observability of the traits in question, with correlations ranging from 0.25 to 0.43. In the present study, the strong link between convergent validity and inter-rater agreement was replicated and both of these agreement indexes (i.e., inter-rater agreement and self-other convergence) were highly correlated with trait observability. Apparently, given that the rater and the ratee are both observing a common object called "self", the more observable that aspect of "self" is to the others, the more probable it is to gain agreement among raters and between raters and ratees

Overlap between Personality and Group Behavior

SYMLOG factors. The SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form was adopted and its factor structure was determined in the present study. With regard to the four factors extracted, it is worthwhile to describe the nature of the factors. Dominant Behavior is characterized by an outgoing and assertive leadership style in the Chinese; Emotional Expressiveness is characterized by emotionally unstable, hostile and provocative behaviors; Friendliness seems to describe members who are trustworthy and work

responsibly for the group; and Distracting Sociability is best understood as entertaining and joking around in a working group context.

Wish, Deutsch, and Kaplan (1976) conducted a study to explore the perceived dimensions of interpersonal behaviors. They identified fours factors with the American subjects. They are "cooperative and friendly versus competitive and hostile", "socioemotional and informal versus task-oriented and formal", "equal versus unequal", "intense versus superficial". Further, they claimed that their first three factors had resemblance to Triandis' (1972) "association versus dissociation", "intimacy", and "superordination versus subordination".

As Bales, Cohen, and Williamson (1979) suggested, the SYMLOG provides a set of methods for the study of groups - especially small working groups, where the personalities of the specific persons involved and their relationships with one another are the focus of interest. Essentially, the four factors identified with the SYMLOG have high resemblance with the four factors of Wish, Deutsch, and Kaplan (1976). The correspondence between the results from the two investigations provides the author the assurance that the fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationship have been obtained in the present study.

Relationship to the SAPPS. An attempt was made to investigate the external validity of the eight self-reported personality factors in predicting how one is perceived by others in terms of individual group performance. Given the use of two different methods of observation (self-reports and peer ratings) and two different measuring tools (SAPPS and SYMLOG), the percentage variance accounted for indicates a pragmatic baseline for asserting the existence of real consistencies in human experience and group behavior.

With regard to the present study, self-reported personality does not explain a lot of group behavior, but varies in its explanatory power in different behavioral dimensions. 3% represents the lowest percentage variance accounted for by the eight factors in the SYMLOG Friendliness. It is suggested that the personality dimensions are relatively insensitive to this particular aspect of interpersonal group behavior. On the other hand, for the SYMLOG Dominant Behavior, it was well predicted by Extraversion, Assertiveness, Helpfulness, and Intellect (33%). The portion of variance represents a strong link between self-reported personality and group behavior. The reason may be one of group relevance in the present study.

At the beginning of the semester, all subjects were informed that the final assignment was to devise a measuring tool to evaluate the contribution of each group member to the group functioning. Therefore, all subjects knew that they would be evaluated, and this assignment became a sort of regulatory mechanism in the groups.

With regard to the correlational pattern, there is obviously a wide range of differences, from 3% to 33% of percentage variance explained. It is interesting to note that two factors of group behavior, Dominant Behavior and Distracting Sociability evidence higher correlations with self-reported personality. Speaking up and joking around are so obvious and group-demanded that the salience of these traits will be exemplified and will contribute to the impressions of group members. Therefore, there is a high correspondence between self-reported personality and the perception of these two areas of group behavior. On the other hand, subjects may tend to regulate or manage the manifestation of certain trait-related behaviors which are thought to be undesirable in group work. Emotional Expressiveness and Friendliness are less desirable and therefore

more likely to be managed by subjects, such as hiding their manifestations from the group settings. So, it is not surprising that self-reports of personality are less predictive of these group behaviors. Perhaps, if other interpersonal contexts were used instead of the present group context, self-reports of personality would be more predictive of group behavior.

Self-Other Discrepancy in Personality Ratings

Self-effacement: Group level. When group means of different personality dimensions were considered, the normal subjects in the present study generally rated themselves lower than the others rated them. Contrary to the findings in the West where normal people have overly positive self-perception (see Taylor & Brown, 1988), the Chinese subjects significantly downplayed themselves on four of the eight socially desirable factors. The same modesty bias was evident in the SYMLOG dimensions, in which subjects rated themselves higher in Emotional Expressiveness and Distracting Sociability than others rated them.

It is instructive to note that there is a high and negative correlation between self-ratings and observability ratings across the eight dimensions (-0.70). It seems reasonable to conclude that when a dimension is more observable, subjects tend to gain a consensus in assigning personality ratings according the social norms. Modesty tendency, which is a socially appropriate behavior in Chinese societies, is so pervasive that the subjects show conformity to this socially approved norm, that is, self-deprecating attribution.

The nature of modesty tendency in the interdependent cultures like Chinese societies reflect, or are accompanied by psychologically authentic self-perceptions (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). People in these societies acquire a habitual modest-

responses tendency and they pay particular attention to the other rather than to the self. Whenever certain aspects of self are appraised in public, the self-deprecating biases become evident. It is postulated that modest responses may engender praises and pleasant feelings. This is a way to maintain interpersonal relationship and hence harmony, which is highly valued in these societies.

Self-effacement: Individual level. In the previous studies on the self-other discrepancy in ratings (e.g., Lewinsohn, Mischel, & Chaplin, 1980), the researchers arbitrarily selected two groups of subjects, one was normal and the other was say depressed. Then their attempt was to compare self- and other ratings within each group and the resulting different patterns observed in the two groups were claimed to support the notion that the non-depressed subjects (normal subjects with high self-esteem) were generally engaged in overly positive self-perception.

In the present study, instead of using between-group design, the author attempted to study the relationship between self-other discrepancy in personality ratings and self-esteem in a normal population. Also, more importantly, the hierarchical regression analyses were adopted in which the unique contribution of self-enhancement to self-esteem was tracked. Surprisingly, the results obtained indicate that self-esteem was correlated neither with accuracy in perception nor with the self-enhancement tendency, as argued persuasively by Taylor and Brown (1988). The only finding in that self-esteem is positively correlated with the self-ratings of seven personality factors which are socially desirable in a group context. Normal subjects are characterized with a halo or glow that involves an overall positive self-perception that is related to self-esteem.

One point noteworthy is that self-esteem was predicted by three of the eight self-

reported personality factors, Intellect, Assertiveness, and Application (48%). In line with Luk and Bond's (1992) argument, two characteristics of the present sample helped produce this result: they are Chinese and are working in groups. Intellect and Application reflect part of the Chinese morality, which includes that qualities of thinking clearly, concentration, diligence, and hardwork. It has been pronounced as extremely important and highly valued in the Chinese culture and has broad influence in guiding behavior in this culture (Bond, 1983). Assertiveness means to speak out, to be decisive and forceful, which are salient aspects in group work. For the sake of effective group functioning, both personality characteristics are very important. Perception of oneself as possessing these attributes generates a positive well-being which in turn leads to higher self-esteem in the present group context.

Given 48% as the highest percentage variance accounted for by the self-perception of personality, other determinants of self-esteem have been suggested, such as negative life events (Young, Rathge, Mullis, & Mullis, 1990), experience of success or failure (Jones, Brenner, & Knight, 1990), and so forth.

What Is Special About Working Groups?

The opportunity to study personality in course working groups allowed us to track the external validity of self-reports of personality, while controlling for the level of acquaintanceship and discussion topics. In the meantime, special attention should be paid to the implications of evaluating validities in this group setting. The working group may alter the manifestation of traits: Due to the high demand for impression management in the group context, members might mask the manifestation of certain traits (Paulhus, 1986). If such impression management effects are really under operation in the present

study, the modest validities obtained might simply reflect a matter of pragmatics. It seems unreasonable to assert the self-other convergence correlations represent an upper-bound estimate of the validity of self-ratings. Although past research has demonstrated that self-ratings are full of biases and artifacts (see Wiggins, 1973) and people consistently respond in an overly enhancing way (e.g., Paulhus, 1984; Sackeim & Gur, 1978), it is plausible to grant self-raters some benefits of full access to their life experience and thus consistencies in behaviors. Under these circumstances, peer ratings are best understood as serving a valuable validity check. Also, personality traits are summaries of people's styles and tendencies, not behavior counts. The process of trait inference requires extracting the meaning of behavior in the context. Under this condition, the pursuit of perfect or near perfect agreement is not appropriate (see Rosenberg, 1979).

Summary

In the present study, the results clearly demonstrated the consensual validity of self-reports of personality. An attempt was made to explain the varying degree of self-other convergence across the personality dimensions. The study found no evidence for self-reported personality dimensions as moderator variables in self-other convergence. However, the observability ratings of different dimensions in a group context successfully influence the degree of self-other convergence, with higher validity coefficients for more observable personality characteristics. Also, self-deprecating modesty tendency (when means of self- and other ratings were compared) was highly and negatively correlated with observability ratings which implies that subjects seem to be more obliged to the socially appropriate behavior (modesty) in the more observable personality dimensions.

References

Alright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments at zero acquaintance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 387-395.

Alicke, M. D. (1985). Global self-evaluation as determined by the desirability and controllability of trait adjectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1621-1630.

Bales, R. F. (1970). Personality and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bales, R. F., Cohen, S.P., & Williamson, S. A. (1979). SYMLOG: A system for the multiple level observation of groups. New York: The Free Press.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1173-1182.

Bem, D. J., & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. Psychological Review, 81, 506-520.

Bond, M. H. (1983). Linking person perception dimensions to behavioral intention dimensions: The Chinese connection. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14, 41-63.

Brown, J. D. (1986). Evaluations of self and others: Self-enhancement biases in social judgments. Social Cognition, 4, 353-376.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by

the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Cattell, R. B. (1946). Description and measurement of personality. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World Book.

Chaplin, W. F. (1991). The next generation of moderator research in personality psychology. Journal of Personality, 59, 143-178.

Cheek, J. M. (1982). Aggregation, moderator variables, and the validity of personality tests: A peer-rating study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 1254-1269.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

D'Andrade, R. G. (1965). Trait psychology and componential analysis. American Anthropologist, 67, 215-228.

D'Andrade, R. G. (1974). Memory and the assessment of behavior. In H. Blalock (Ed.), Measurement in the social sciences (pp. 159-186). Chicago: Aldine.

Endler, N. S., & Magnusson, D. (Eds.). (1976). Interactional psychology and personality. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.

Epstein, S. (1980). The stability of behavior: II. Implications for psychological research. American Psychologist, 35, 790-806.

Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44, 329-344.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1984). Social cognition. Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley.

Funder, D. C., & Colvin, C. R. (1988). Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship,

agreement, and the accuracy of personality judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 149-158.

Funder, D. C., & Dobroth, K. M. (1984). Differences between traits: Properties associated with interjudge agreement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 409-418.

Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. American Psychologist, 35, 603-618.

Haggard, E. A. (1958). Intraclass correlation and the analysis of variance. New York: Dryden Press.

Isenberg, D. J., & Ennis, J. G. (1981). Perceiving group members: A comparison of derived and imposed dimensions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 293-305.

John, O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp.66-100). New York: Guilford Press.

Jones, E. E., Brenner, K. J., & Knight, J. G. (1990). When failure elevates self-esteem. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16, 200-209.

Kane, J. S., & Lawler, E. E., III. (1978). Methods of peer assessment. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 555-586.

Kenrick, D. T., & Funder, D. C. (1988). Profiting from controversy: Lessons from the person-situation debate. American Psychologist, 43, 23-34.

Kenrick, D. T., & Stringfield, D. O. (1980). Personality traits and the eye of the beholder: Crossing some traditional philosophical boundaries in the search for

consistency in all of the people. Psychological Review, 87, 88-104.

Lau, S. (1989). Sex role orientation and domains of self-esteem. Sex roles, 21, 415-422.

Leung, J. P., & Leung, K. (in press). Life satisfaction, self-concept, and relationship with parents in adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence.

Lewinsohn, P. M., Mischel, W., Chaplin, W., & Barton, R. (1980). Social competence an depression: The role of illusory self-perceptions. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 89, 203-212.

Lippa, R., & Mash, M. (1981). The effects of self-monitoring and self-reported consistency on the consistency of personality judgments made by strangers and intimates. Journal of Research in Personality, 15, 172-181.

Luk, C. L., & Bond, M. H. (1992). Explaining Chinese self-esteem in terms of the self-concept. Psychologia, 35, 147-154.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.

McCrae, R. R. (1982). Consensual validation of personality traits: Evidence from self-reports and ratings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 293-303.

Mills, C., & Hogan, R. (1978). A role theoretical interpretation of personality scale item responses. Journal of Personality, 46, 778-785.

Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley.

Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 564-583.

Norman, W. T., & Goldberg, L. R. (1966). Raters, ratees, and randomness in personality structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 681-691.

Passini, F. T., Norman, W. T. (1966). A universal conception of personality structure? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 44-49.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.

Paulhus, D. L. (1986). Self-deception and impression management in test responses. In A. Angleitner, & J. S. Wiggins (Eds.), Self-report via questionnaire. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Paulhus, D. L., & Bruce, M. N. (1992). The effect of acquaintanceship on the validity of personality impressions: A longitudinal study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 816-824.

Paunonen, S. V. (1989). Consensus in personality judgments: Moderating effects of target-rater acquaintanceship and behavior observability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 823-833.

Paunonen, S. V., & Jackson, D. N. (1988). Type I error rates for moderated multiple regression analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 569-573.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.

Ruehlman, L. S., West, S. G., & Pasahow, R. J. (1985). Depression and evaluation schemata. Journal of Personality, 53, 46-92.

Sackeim, H. A., & Gur, R. C. (1978). Self-deception, self-confrontation, and

consciousness. In G. E. Schwartz, & D. Shapiro (Eds.), Consciousness and self-regulation: Advances in research (Vol. 2, pp.139-197). New York: Plenum Press.

Shrauger, J. S., & Schoeneman, T. J. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 549-573.

Shweder, R. A. (1975). How relevant is an individual difference theory of personality? Journal of Personality, 43, 455-484.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 193-210.

Tennen, H., & Herzberger, S. (1987). Depression, self-esteem, and the absence of self-protective attributional biases. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 72-80.

Triandis, H. C. (1972). The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Academic Press.

Tseng, W. H. (1972). On Chinese national characters from the viewpoint of personality development. In Y. Y. Li, & K. S. Yang (Eds.), Symposium on the Character of the Chinese. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica. (In Chinese).

Watson, D. (1989). Strangers' ratings of the five robust personality factors: Evidence of a surprising convergence with self-repot. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 120-128.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1991). Self- versus peer ratings of specific emotional traits: Evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. Journal of Personality and

Social Psychology, 60, 927-940.

Weiss, D. S. (1979). The effects of systematic variations in information on judges' descriptions of personality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 2121-2136.

Wessman, A. E., & Ricks, D. F. (1966). Mood and personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wiggins, J. S. (1973). Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Willerman, L. (1979). The psychology of individual and group differences. San Francisco: Freeman.

Wish, M., Deutsch, M., & Kaplan, S. J. (1976). Perceived dimensions of interpersonal relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 409-420.

Wymer, W. E., & Penner, L. A. (1985). Moderator variables and different types of predictability: Do you have a match? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1002-1015.

Yik, M. S. M., Bond, M. H. (1993). Exploring the dimensions of Chinese person perception with indigenous and imported constructs: Creating a culturally balanced scale. International Journal of Psychology, 28, 75-95.

Young, G. A., Rathge, R., Mullis, R., & Mullis, A. (1990). Adolescent stress and self-esteem. Adolescence, 25, 333-341.

Zuckerman, M. (1979). Attribution of success and failure revisited, or: The motivational bias is alive an dwell in attribution theory. Journal of Personality, 47, 245-287.

Zuckerman, M., Kowstner, R., Deboy, T., Garcia, T., Maresca, B. C., & Sartoris, J.

M. (1988). To predict some of the people some of the time: A reexamination of the moderator variable approach in personality theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 1006-1019.

Zuckerman, M., & Lubin, B. (1985). Manual for the MAACL-R: The Multiple Affect Adjective Check List Revised. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.

Table 1
Monomethod Correlations Among the Personality Dimensions

	EMS	EXT	APP	OPE	ASS	RES	HEL	INT
EMS	1	-08	08	-03	-06	27*	49**	31**
EXT	11	1	-09	74**	44**	-21	14	23*
APP	11	16	1	05	36**	74**	46**	66**
OPE	03	45**	00	1	74**	-07	09	49**
ASS	22	30**	16	57**	1	17	02	68**
RES	26*	-17	43**	-24*	09	1	43**	63**
HEL	51**	20*	18	18	27*	32**	1	47**
INT	32**	15	34**	29**	50**	35**	33**	1

Note. N=130. Self-rating correlations are below the diagonal; peer rating correlations are above the diagonal. Decimal points are omitted. EMS to INT stand for Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect respectively.

* $p < 0.01$, two-tailed.
** $p < 0.001$, two-tailed.

Table 2
Self-Peer Correlations Among Personality Dimensions

	Peer Ratings							
Self-Ratings	EMS	EXT	APP	OPE	ASS	RES	HEL	INT
EMS	42**	-12	09	-11	02	13	18	15
EXT	-08	63**	-13	39**	25*	-24*	04	04
APP	-09	-03	17	-01	12	15	-05	05
OPE	-09	37**	-12	39**	29**	-25*	-13	03
ASS	02	22	21	36**	46**	09	-04	29**
RES	07	-17	36**	-10	08	42**	08	22
HEL	14	02	18	-04	-05	10	25*	00
INT	12	03	17	17	34**	24**	-11	28**

Note. N=130. Convergent correlations are underlined. Decimal points are omitted. EMS to INT stand for Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect respectively.

* $p < 0.01$, two-tailed.
** $p < 0.001$, two-tailed.

Table 3
Psychometric Properties of Self- and Peer Ratings in Personality Dimensions

	Self-Ratings	Peer Ratings	
	alpha	ICC	alpha
EMS	80	31	87
EXT	82	56	92
APP	67	43	88
OPE	86	46	94
ASS	61	49	90
RES	81	48	89
HEL	67	31	87
INT	79	36	85

Note. N=130. ICC is the intraclass correlation; decimal points are omitted. EMS to INT stand for Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect respectively.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for the SAPPS Observability Ratings

	M	SD	alpha
EMS	3.66	0.53	0.77
EXT	3.98	0.43	0.63
APP	3.31	0.51	0.62
OPE	3.01	0.53	0.71
ASS	3.64	0.41	0.58
RES	3.54	0.36	0.47
HEL	2.93	0.47	0.55
INT	3.27	0.55	0.72

Note. N=16. Possible scores range from 1 to 5.EMS to INT stand for Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect respectively.

Table 5
Factor Analysis of the SYMLOG items (Averaged Peer Ratings)

Items	Varimax Rotated Factors 1	2	3	4
1. Dominant Behavior	(alpha=0.87)			
a purposeful democratic task leader	87	-01	13	20
analytical, task-oriented, problem-solving	81	10	13	-19
an assertive business-like manager	80	20	-16	-07
afraid to try, doubt own ability	-78	23	13	-11
active, dominant, talk a lot	74	23	-09	47
obedient, work submissively	-65	-04	41	-25
alienated, quit, withdraw	-53	29	-19	-28
2. Emotional Expressiveness		(alpha=0.75)		
depressed, sad, resentful	-20	76	-06	01
unfriendly, negativistic	09	74	-31	-14
irritable, cynical, won't co-operate	12	74	-30	06
provocative, egocentric, show off	30	65	-34	03
legalistic, have to be right	-15	57	02	-20
self-punishing, work too hard	29	49	15	-46
3. Friendliness			(alpha=0.79)	
gentle, willing to accept responsibility	06	-03	81	-08
work co-operatively with others	04	-28	77	16
look up to others, appreciative, trustful	09	-29	69	21
friendly, equalitarian	-05	-44	58	40
quietly happy just to be with others	-29	-02	58	-00
4. Distracting Sociability				(alpha=0.78)
joke around, expressive, dramatic	16	-02	-07	85
affectionate, likeable, fun to be with	14	-15	37	80
entertaining, sociable, smiling, warm	12	-29	36	75
show feelings and emotions	15	49	-10	57

Note. N=130. This is the principal-components analysis. Loadings greater than or equal to 0.53 in absolute magnitude are underlined; decimal points are omitted. The coefficient alphas are calculated by including those salient items (0.53 criterion) in each of the four factors extracted.

Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations for Self- and Peer Ratings of the SYMLOG dimensions

	Self-Ratings		Peer Ratings		
Dimensions	M	SD	M	SD	t
DOB (7)	2.13	0.35	2.17	0.32	-1.61
EME (5)	1.44	0.33	1.23	0.18	6.71**
FRI (5)	2.60	0.30	2.56	0.20	1.31
SOC (4)	2.27	0.42	2.10	0.32	4.86**

Note. N=130. The number of items in each dimension is shown in parentheses. The mean scores range from 1 to 3. DOB to SOC stand for Dominant Behavior, Emotional Expressiveness, Friendliness, and Distracting Sociability respectively.

** $p < 0.001$, two-tailed.

Table 7
Prediction of the averaged peer perception of SYMLOG dimensions by the self-perception of the SAPPS factors

	Beta weights of the SAPPS dimensions									
SYMLOG	EMS[b]	EXT	APP	OPE	ASS	RES	HEL	INT	MR	R^2
DOB[a]	--	30	--	--	32	--	-27	21	58	33
EME	-26	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	26	07
FRI	17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	03
SOC	--	46	--	--	--	--	--	--	46	21

Note. Only those beta weights significant at 0.05 level are listed; decimal points are omitted.

[a] DOB to SOC stand for Dominant Behavior, Emotional Expressiveness, Friendliness, and Distracting Sociability respectively.

[b] EMS to INT stand for Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect respectively.

Table 8
Means and Standard Deviations for Self- and Peer Ratings

	Self-Ratings		Peer Ratings		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
EMS (4)	5.02	1.44	5.61	0.93	-4.99**
EXT (4)	5.19	1.50	5.60	1.23	-3.90**
APP (4)	5.96	1.17	6.34	0.78	-3.38**
OPE (4)	5.68	1.52	5.25	1.10	3.31**
ASS (4)	5.44	1.22	5.51	1.05	-0.64
RES (4)	5.68	1.46	5.99	0.88	-2.66*
HEL (4)	5.83	1.13	6.07	0.74	-2.32
INT (4)	6.12	1.18	6.17	0.73	-0.49

Note. N=130. The number of items in each dimension is shown in parentheses. The mean scores range from 1 to 9. EMS to INT stand for Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect respectively.

* $p < 0.01$, two-tailed.
** $p < 0.001$, two-tailed.

Appendix I The SAPPS - short form

Emotional Stability

- Unhurried & unworried -- Tense & doubtful
- Relaxed -- Relaxed
- At ease -- Nervous
- Even-tempered -- Temperamental

Extraversion

- Sociable -- Unsociable
- Passionate -- Cold
- Talkative -- Quiet
- Extroverted -- Introverted

Application

- Hardworking -- Lazy
- Promising & diligent in work -- Dispirited
- Work hard without drawing -- Talk without taking action
- Practical -- Impractical

Openness to Experience

- Prefer variety -- Prefer regularity
- Adventurous -- conservative
- Prefer novel ways -- Follow routine
- Eager to change -- Satisfied with status quo

Assertiveness

- Determined -- Hesitant
- Independent -- Dependent
- Forceful -- Submissive
- Individualistic -- Conforming

Restraint

- Thorough -- Careless
- Cautious -- Rash
- Conscientious -- Negligent
- Dignified -- Casual

Helpfulness

- Generous -- Stingy
- Unselfish -- Selfish
- Kind -- Unkind
- Quick to admit own errors -- Inclined to defend own errors

Intellect

- Intelligent -- Unintelligent
- Analytical -- Unanalytical
- Refined -- Vulgar in taste
- Perceptive -- Imperceptive

Appendix II The SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form

Please circle the appropriate word to describe yourself.

1.	active, dominant, talk a lot.	rarely	sometimes	often
2.	extroverted, outgoing, positive.	rarely	sometimes	often
3.	a purposeful democratic task leader.	rarely	sometimes	often
4.	an assertive business-like manager.	rarely	sometimes	often
5.	authoritarian, controlling, disapproving.	rarely	sometimes	often
6.	domineering, tough-minded, powerful.	rarely	sometimes	often
7.	provocative, egocentric, show off.	rarely	sometimes	often
8.	joke around, expressive, dramatic.	rarely	sometimes	often
9.	entertaining, sociable, smiling, warm.	rarely	sometimes	often
10.	friendly, equalitarian.	rarely	sometimes	often
11.	work co-operatively with others.	rarely	sometimes	often
12.	analytical, task-oriented, problem-solving.	rarely	sometimes	often
13.	legalistic, have to be right.	rarely	sometimes	often
14.	unfriendly, negativistic.	rarely	sometimes	often
15.	irritable, cynical, won't co-operate.	rarely	sometimes	often
16.	show feelings and emotions.	rarely	sometimes	often
17.	affectionate, likeable, fun to be with.	rarely	sometimes	often
18.	look up to others, appreciative, trustful.	rarely	sometimes	often
19.	gentle, willing to accept responsibility.	rarely	sometimes	often
20.	obedient, work submissively.	rarely	sometimes	often
21.	self-punishing, work too hard.	rarely	sometimes	often
22.	depressed, sad, resentful.	rarely	sometimes	often
23.	alienated, quit, withdraw.	rarely	sometimes	often
24.	afraid to try, doubt own ability	rarely	sometimes	often
25.	quietly happy just to be with others.	rarely	sometimes	often
26.	passive, introverted, say little	rarely	sometimes	often

Appendix III Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale

Please record the appropriate answer per item, depending on whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree with it.

1 = Strongly agree

2 = Agree

3 = Disagree

4 = Strongly disagree

___ 1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

___ 2. At times I think I am no good at all.

___ 3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

___ 4. I an able to do things as well as most other people.

___ 5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

___ 6. I certainly feel useless at times.

___ 7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

___ 8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

___ 9. All In all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

___ 10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.